UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,200	03/24/2004	Georg Mayer	NOKM.090PA	3914

7590   07/09/2008

Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC
Suite 125
8009 34th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55425

EXAMINER
SHIU, HO T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 March 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 March 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10 November 2004, 01 July 2005</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-35 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4.   With respect to claim 35, "Computer-readable medium" is being recited. According to page 27-28 of the applicant's specification, " "computer-readable medium(s)" as used herein is intended to encompass a computer program that exists permanently or temporarily on such computer-usable medium or in any transmitting medium which transmits such a program". Also, a memory/storage devices include but are not limited to, "disks, optical disks, ... and other stationary or mobile network systems/communication links." Since computer-readable medium is a computer program that exists permanently or temporarily in any transmitting medium and transmitting mediums include transmission via wireless/radio wave communication networks, it implies that the computer-readable program exists on the transmission process of the wireless/radio wave network which transfer data

through waves and propagated signals.   Waves or propagated signals is not one of

the statutory subject matters. See MPEP § 2106.01

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed
> publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6.   Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by

Campbell et al., "Instant message sessions in simple", hereinafter Campbell.

7.   With respect to claim 1, Campbell discloses a method for enforcing a

signaling-level policy on bearer-level session-mode messaging, comprising (pg. 4,

lines 10-13): initiating session-mode messaging involving a first communication

device and one or more second communication devices (pg. 4, lines 1-13);

imposing a policy by a signaling-level session control element on at least the first

communication device to establish a bearer-level binding between the first

communication device and bearer-level relay (pg. 6, lines 1-3, lines 15-16);

determining a state of the bearer-level binding, and providing the state of the bearer-

level binding to the signaling-level session control element (pg. 6, lines 17-31, pg. 8,

lines 4-10); and at the signaling-level session control element, allowing or

disallowing the session-mode messaging based on the state of the bearer-level

binding (pg. 8, lines 4-10).

8.   With respect to claim 2, Campbell discloses wherein imposing a policy

comprises requiring the first communication device to include the bearer-level relay

in a path of the session-mode messaging between the first communication device

and the one or more second communication devices (pg. 6, lines 17-23).

9.   With respect to claim 3, Campbell discloses wherein the session-mode

messaging is conducted using a Message Session Relay Protocol (MSRP) and the

bearer-level relay comprises an MSRP relay (pg. 6, lines 17-23, pg. 22, pg. 23), and

further comprising the first communication device issuing an MSRP BIND message

to the MSRP relay to establish the bearer-level binding between the first

communication device and the MSRP relay (pg. 7, lines 11-16, pg. 22, pg. 23).

10.   With respect to claim 4, Campbell discloses further comprising updating the

state of the bearer-level binding to indicate a binding confirmation if the MSRP relay

receives the MSRP BIND message from the first communication device (pg. 8, lines

4-10, pg. 22, pg. 23), wherein allowing or disallowing the session-mode messaging

comprises the signaling-level session control element allowing the session-mode

messaging where the state of the bearer-level binding indicates the binding

confirmation (pg. 7, lines 11-16, pg. 22, pg. 23).

11.   With respect to claim 5, Campbell discloses determining a state of the bearer-level binding comprises determining whether the state of the bearer-level binding has been updated to indicate a binding confirmation in response to the MSRP relay receiving the MSRP BIND message within a predetermined time (pg. 7, lines 7-10, pg. 8, lines 4-10, pg. 22, pg. 23); and allowing or disallowing the session-mode messaging comprises the signaling-level session control element disallowing the session-mode messaging where the state of the bearer-level binding has not been updated to indicate the binding confirmation within the predetermined time (pg. 7, lines 7-10, pg. 8, lines 4-10, pg. 22, pg. 23.

12.   **Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kalland et al. (WO 2004/008687 A1, hereinafter Kalland). Kalland is cited in the applicant's IDS filed on 07/01/2005.**

13.   With respect to claim 23, Kalland discloses a method for enforcing signaling-level policies directed to bearer-level message sessions, comprising: initiating at least one policy at a signaling level (pg. 4, lines 13-29); imposing the policy on a communication device anticipating involvement in a message session (pg. 4, lines 13-29); determining at the bearer level whether the communication device has complied with the policy (pg. 12, lines 4-10); notifying the signaling level if it is

determined at the bearer level that the communication device has complied with the

policy (pg. 12, lines 4-10); and allowing the communication device to engage in the

message session in response to receipt of the notification of policy compliance at the

signaling level (pg. 12, lines 4-10).

14.   With respect to claim 24, Kalland discloses wherein initiating at least one

policy at a signaling level comprises initiating a policy requiring the communication

device to include an intermediary in a bearer-level path of the message session

(abstract, pg. 12, lines 4-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

16.   **Claims 6-11, 14-15, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Campbell in view of Kalland.

17.   With respect to claim 6, Campbell discloses a method for enforcing signaling-

level policies directed to bearer-level message sessions, comprising (pg. 4, line 10-

13): imposing at least one policy on a communication device anticipating

participation in a message session (pg. 9, lines 16-20), wherein the policy is initiated

at a signaling-level element and includes a directive for the communication device to

include an intermediary in a path of the message session (pg. 8, lines 12-14, pg. 9,

lines 16-20, pg. 16, lines 7-10); determining whether the communication device has

included the intermediary in the path of the message session (pg. 22, lines 10-36,

pg. 23) but does not clearly disclose notifying the signaling-level element if it is

determined that the communication device has included the intermediary in the path

of the message session; and enabling the communication device to participate in

the message session in response to the signaling-level element receiving the

notification.

In the same field of endeavor, Kalland discloses notifying the signaling-level

element if it is determined that the communication device has included the

intermediary in the path of the message session (pg. 12, lines 4-10); and enabling

the communication device to participate in the message session in response to the

signaling-level element receiving the notification (pg. 12, lines 4-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell with the teachings

of Kalland in order to ensure in such a way that data traffic cannot pass through the

port without a path between sessions so monitoring of all traffic can be

accomplished.

18.   With respect to claim 7, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6 above. In addition, Kalland discloses further comprising disallowing the communication device to participate in the message session if it is determined that the communication device has not included the intermediary in the path of the message session (pg. 7, lines 9-14).

19.   With respect to claim 8, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6 above. In addition, Kalland discloses wherein determining whether the communication device has included the intermediary in the path of the message session comprises determining whether the signaling-level element receives the notification within a predetermined time (pg. 12, lines 21-26).

20.   With respect to claim 9, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6 above. In addition, Kalland discloses wherein determining whether the communication device has included the intermediary in the path of the message session comprises determining whether the intermediary has received from the communication device a binding message identifying the intermediary (pg. 12, lines 4-10).

21.   With respect to claim 10, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6 above. In addition, Kalland discloses further comprising the communication device including the intermediary into the path of the message session by issuing a binding message to the intermediary to establish the intermediary as a portion of the path of the

message session (pg. 12, lines 4-10).

22.   With respect to claim 11, Campbell discloses wherein the message session is

conducted using a Message Session Relay Protocol (MSRP) and the intermediary

comprises an MSRP relay, and wherein issuing a binding message to the

intermediary comprises issuing an MSRP BIND message from the communication

device to the MSRP relay (pg. 6, lines 9-16), pg. 7, lines 7-16, pg. 22-23).

23.   With respect to claim 14, Campbell discloses wherein the message session is

conducted using a Message Session Relay Protocol (MSRP) and the intermediary

comprises an MSRP relay (pg. 6, lines 17-23, pg. 22-23).

24.   With respect to claim 15, Campbell discloses further comprising sending an

MSRP BIND message from the communication device to the MSRP relay to include

the MSRP relay in the path of the message session(pg. 6, lines 1-8, pg. 7, lines 11-

17, pg. 22-23).

25.   With respect to claim 25, Campbell discloses wherein the intermediary is

configured to receive at least one binding message from the first communication

device but does not clearly disclose a system for enforcing signaling-level policies in

an IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS) network, comprising: a first communication

device capable of communicating signaling messages via the IMS network and

participating in session-mode messaging via a bearer path; a signaling-level proxy

configured to impose at least one policy on the first communication device via the

IMS network; wherein the policy requires the first communication device to include

the intermediary into the bearer path of the session-mode messaging; an

intermediary configured to relay messages of the session-mode messaging between

the communication device and one or more second communication devices, and in

response to provide compliance information indicating compliance of the policy by

the first communication device; and wherein the signaling-level proxy is configured

to enable the session-mode messaging in response to the compliance information.

In the same field of endeavor, Kalland discloses a system for enforcing

signaling-level policies in an IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS) network, comprising: a

first communication device capable of communicating signaling messages via the

IMS network and participating in session-mode messaging via a bearer path

(abstract); a signaling-level proxy configured to impose at least one policy on the

first communication device via the IMS network (pg. 12, lines 4-10); wherein the

policy requires the first communication device to include the intermediary into the

bearer path of the session-mode messaging (pg. 12, lines 4-10); an intermediary

configured to relay messages of the session-mode messaging between the

communication device and one or more second communication devices, and in

response to provide compliance information indicating compliance of the policy by

the first communication device (pg. 12, lines 4-10); and wherein the signaling-level

proxy is configured to enable the session-mode messaging in response to the

compliance information (pg. 12, lines 4-19).

       Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell with the teachings

of Kalland in order ensure in such a way that data traffic cannot pass through the

port without a path between sessions so monitoring of all traffic can be

accomplished.

26.   **Claim 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**
Campbell in view of Official Notice.

27.   With respect to claim 35, Campbell discloses enforcing a signaling-level

policy on bearer-level session-mode messaging by performing steps comprising:

imposing a policy by a signaling-level session control element on at least a first

communication device to establish a bearer-level binding between the first

communication device and bearer-level relay (pg. 8, lines 12-14, pg. 9, lines 16-20,

pg. 16, lines 7-10); determining a state of the bearer-level binding between the first

communication device and the bearer-level relay (pg.7, lines 7-10, pg. 8, lines 4-10);

and allowing or disallowing the first communication device to engage in a message

session based on the state of the bearer-level binding (pg. 7, lines 7-10, pg8, lines 4-

10) but does not clearly disclose one or more computer-readable mediums having

instructions stored thereon that are executable by computing systems.

In the same field of endeavor, the examiner takes official notice that discloses

one or more computer-readable mediums having instructions stored thereon that are

executable by computing systems.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell with the teachings

of official notice to be able to copy/transfer/duplicate the same instructions/methods

to another system in a more feasible manner.

28.   **Claims 12-13, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Campbell in view of Kalland as applied to claims 6 and 25

and in further view of Wong et al. "Supporting Real-Time IP multimedia

Services in UMTS", hereinafter Wong.

29.   With respect to claim 12, Campbell and Kalland does not clearly disclose

wherein imposing at least one policy that is initiated at a signaling-level element

comprises imposing the policy via a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-

CSCF) within an Internet Protocol (IP) Multimedia Subsystem (IMS).

In the same field of endeavor, Wong discloses wherein imposing at least one

policy that is initiated at a signaling-level element comprises imposing the policy via

a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) within an Internet Protocol (IP)

Multimedia Subsystem (IMS) (pg. 152, Call/session control & PSTN networking, PG.

154, Registration & session setup).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell and Kalland with the teachings of Wong in order to handle SIP registrations which allows it to bind the user location and the SIP address

30.   With respect to claim 13, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above. In addition, Wong discloses wherein imposing the policy via an S-CSCF within an IMS comprises sending the policy from the S-CSCF to the communication (pg. 154-155, session setup).

31.   With respect to claim 26, Campbell discloses the session-mode messaging is conducted using a Message Session Relay Protocol (MSRP) via the bearer path (pg. 22-23); and the intermediary comprises an MSRP relay (pg. 22-23).

        However, Campbell and Kalland does not clearly disclose the signaling-level proxy comprises a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF).

        In the same field of endeavor, Wong discloses the signaling-level proxy comprises a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) (pg. 152).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell and Kalland with the teachings of Wong in order to handle SIP registrations which allows it to bind the user location and the SIP address

32.   With respect to claim 27, Campbell and Kalland does not clearly disclose wherein the MSRP relay comprises an Multimedia Resource Function Processor (MRFP).

In the same field of endeavor, Wong discloses wherein the MSRP relay comprises an Multimedia Resource Function Processor (MRFP) (pg. 151, IMS Concepts).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell and Kalland with the teachings of Wong in order to implement all media related functions such as media manipulation.

33.   With respect to claim 28, Campbell discloses wherein the first communication device comprises a processor configured to generate the binding message as an MSRP BIND message for transmission to the MSRP relay to include the MSRP relay into the bearer path for the session-mode messaging (pg. 22-23).

34.   **Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell in view of Kalland as applied to claim 6 and in further view of Bohm et al. "Policy based architecture for the UMTS multimedia domain", hereinafter Bohm.**

35.   With respect to claim 20, Campbell discloses MSRP relay (pg. 22-23) but does not clearly disclose wherein the signaling-level element comprises a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) within an Internet Protocol (IP) Multimedia Subsystem (IMS), and wherein the MSRP relay comprises an Application Server (AS).

Campbell and Kalland does not clearly disclose wherein the signaling-level element comprises a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) within an Internet Protocol (IP) Multimedia Subsystem (IMS), and wherein the MSRP relay comprises an Application Server (AS).

In the same field of endeavor, Wong discloses wherein the signaling-level element comprises a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) within an Internet Protocol (IP) Multimedia Subsystem (IMS), and wherein the MSRP relay comprises an Application Server (AS) (pg. 7, Limitations of the UMTS R5 Architecture).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell and Kalland with the teachings of Bohm in order to implement all media related functions such as media manipulation and support real-time requirements so that the timeframe issues can be addressed by specifying standard policy control interface.

36.   With respect to claim 21, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 20 above. In addition, Bohm discloses further comprising the S-CSCF subscribing to

one or more events at the AS, and wherein notifying the signaling-level element

comprises providing a notification message from the AS to the S-CSCF if it is

determined that the communication device has included the intermediary in the path

of the message session (pg. 7, Limitations of the UMTS R5 Architecture).

37.   **Claims 16-19, 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Campbell in view of Kalland and in further view of Wong as

applied to claims 6, 14, 20, 21, 25, 26, and 28 and in even further view of Bohm.

38.   With respect to claim 16, Campbell discloses and requesting the

communication device to send the MSRP BIND message, including the authorization

token, to the MSRP relay (pg. 22-23) but does not clearly disclose wherein the

signaling-level element comprises a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-

CSCF) within an Internet Protocol (IP) Multimedia Subsystem (IMS), and wherein

imposing at least one policy that is initiated at a signaling-level element comprises:

the S-CSCF requesting generation of an authorization token from a Policy Decision

Function (PDF); transmitting the authorization token to the communication device.

Campbell and Kalland does not clearly disclose wherein the signaling-level

element comprises a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) within an

Internet Protocol (IP) Multimedia Subsystem (IMS), and wherein imposing at least

one policy that is initiated at a signaling-level element comprises: the S-CSCF

requesting generation of an authorization token from a Policy Decision Function

(PDF); transmitting the authorization token to the communication device.

In the same field of endeavor, Wong discloses wherein the signaling-level

element comprises a Serving-Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF) within an

Internet Protocol (IP) Multimedia Subsystem (IMS), and wherein imposing at least

one policy that is initiated at a signaling-level element (Pg. 152, Call/session control

& PSTN Interworking).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell and Kalland with

the teachings of Wong in order to handle SIP registrations which allows it to bind the

user location and the SIP address.

However, Campbell, Kalland, and Wong does not clearly disclose the S-

CSCF requesting generation of an authorization token from a Policy Decision

Function (PDF); transmitting the authorization token to the communication device.

In the same field of endeavor, Bohm discloses the S-CSCF requesting

generation of an authorization token from a Policy Decision Function (PDF) (pg. 5,

UMTS IMS Policy architecture); transmitting the authorization token to the

communication device (pg. 5, UMTS IMS Policy architecture).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, and

Wong with the teachings of Bohm in order to enable coordination between events in

the application layer and the resource management in the IP bearer layer during

session establishment.

39.　　With respect to claim 17, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 16 above.　Campbell, Kalland, and Wong does not clearly disclose determining whether the communication device has included the intermediary in the path of the message session comprises: sending at least the authorization token from the MSRP relay to the PDF via a Go interface;　and determining at the PDF that the communication device is authorized to participate in the message session based on receipt of the authorization token.

In the same field of endeavor, Bohm discloses wherein determining whether the communication device has included the intermediary in the path of the message session comprises: sending at least the authorization token from the MSRP relay to the PDF via a Go interface (pg. 6, 3GPP Go interface and protocol, fig. 4);　and determining at the PDF that the communication device is authorized to participate in the message session based on receipt of the authorization token (pg. 6, 3GPP Go interface and protocol, fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, and Wong with the teachings of Bohm in order to facilitate the necessary communication between the PDF and the validation and initiate a policy information transaction for an existing request state by sending unsolicited decisions and also allow operators to control quality of service in a user plane and exchange charging correlation

information between IMS and GPRS network..

40.   With respect to claim 18, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17

above.   In addition, Bohm discloses wherein notifying the signaling-level element

comprises notifying the S-CSCF by the PDF that the communication device has

included the MSRP relay in the path of the message session and is authorized to

participate in the message session (pg. 5, UMTS IMS Policy architecture).

41.   With respect to claim 19, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 18

above. Campbell, Kalland, and Wong does not clearly disclose wherein notifying the

S-CSCF by the PDF comprises notifying the S-CSCF via a Gq interface between the

S-CSCF and the PDF.

        In the same field of endeavor, Bohm discloses wherein notifying the S-CSCF

by the PDF comprises notifying the S-CSCF via a Gq interface between the S-CSCF

and the PDF (pg. 6, 3GPP Go interface and protocol, fig. 4).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, and

Wong with the teachings of Bohm in order to exchange policy decisions-related

information.

42.   With respect to claim 29, Campbell discloses a MSRP relay and MSRP BIND

message (pg. 22-23).

However, Campbell, Kalland, and Wong does not clearly disclose comprising a Policy Decision Function (PDF) logically coupled between the MSRP relay and the S-CSCF, wherein the MSRP relay is configured to forward an authorization token received via the MSRP BIND message to the PDF, and wherein the PDF is configured to provide the compliance information to the S-CSCF in response to receiving the authorization token.

In the same field of endeavor, Bohm discloses comprising a Policy Decision Function (PDF) logically coupled between the MSRP relay and the S-CSCF (pg. 5, UMTS IMS Policy architecture), wherein the MSRP relay is configured to forward an authorization token received via the MSRP BIND message to the PDF, and wherein the PDF is configured to provide the compliance information to the S-CSCF in response to receiving the authorization token (pg. 5, UMTS IMS Policy architecture).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, and Wong with the teachings of Bohm in order to facilitate the necessary communication between the PDF and the validation and initiate a policy information transaction for an existing request state by sending unsolicited decisions and also allow operators to control quality of service in a user plane and exchange charging correlation information between IMS and GPRS network, enable coordination between events in the application layer and the resource management in the IP bearer layer during session establishment, and to ensure in such a way that data traffic cannot pass through the port without a path between sessions so monitoring of all traffic can be

accomplished.

43.   With respect to claim 30, Campbell discloses a MSRP relay (pg. 22-23). It is

also rejected for the same reasons as claim 29 above.

        However, Campbell, Kalland, and Wong does not clearly disclose a Go

interface between the MSRP relay and the PDF to communicate at least the

authorization token.

        In the same field of endeavor, Bohm discloses a Go interface between the

MSRP relay and the PDF to communicate at least the authorization token (pg. 5,

UMTS IMS Policy architecture).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, and

Wong with the teachings of Bohm in order to facilitate the necessary communication

between the PDF and the validation and initiate a policy information transaction for

an existing request state by sending unsolicited decisions and also allow operators

to control quality of service in a user plane and exchange charging correlation

information between IMS and GPRS network..

44.   With respect to claim 31, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 29

above.

Campbell, Kalland, and Wong does not clearly disclose comprising a Gq

interface between the PDF and the S-CSCF to communicate at least the compliance

information.

In the same field of endeavor, Bohm discloses comprising a Gq interface

between the PDF and the S-CSCF to communicate at least the compliance

information(pg. 6, 3GPP Go interface and protocol, fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, and

Wong with the teachings of Bohm in order to exchange policy decisions-related

information.

45.   **Claims 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Campbell in view of Kalland and in further view of Wong and even further

view of Bohm as applied to claims 25, 26, and 28 and in even further view of

Grech et al., "Service control architecture in the UMTS IP Multimedia core

network subsystem", hereinafter Grech.

46.   With respect to claim 32, Campbell discloses a MSRP relay (pg. 22-23).

However, Campbell, Kalland, Wong, and Bohm does not clearly disclose

wherein the MSRP relay comprises an Application Server (AS), and wherein the S-

CSCF is configured to subscribe to an event package at the AS for notifications

regarding the compliance information.

In the same field of endeavor, Grech discloses an Application Server (AS), and wherein the S-CSCF is configured to subscribe to an event package at the AS for notifications regarding the compliance information (pg. 2, Service Invocation & Service Platforms and Interfaces).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, Wong, and Bohm with the teachings of Grech in order to host and execute services, and interface with the S-CSCF using SIP.

47.   With respect to claim 33, Campbell discloses a MSRP relay and MSRP BIND message (pg. 22-23). It is also rejected for the same reasons as claim 32 above.

However, Campbell, Kalland, Wong, and Bohm does not clearly disclose wherein the AS is configured to issue a notification to the subscribing S-CSCF via an IMS Service Control (ISC) interface.

In the same field of endeavor, Grech discloses wherein the AS is configured to issue a notification to the subscribing S-CSCF via an IMS Service Control (ISC) interface (pg. 2, service platforms and interfaces).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, Wong, and Bohm with the teachings of Grech in order to exchange messages between CSCF and AS.

48.   **Claims 22 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Campbell in view of Kalland and in further view of Wong

and even further view of Bohm and even further view of Grech as applied to

claims 6, 14, 20-21, 25, 26, 28, 32-33 and in even further view of Tosi, "An

Advanced Architecture for Push Services", hereinafter Tosi.

49.   With respect to claim 22, Campbell, Kalland, Wong, and Bohm does not

clearly disclose wherein providing a notification message from the AS to the S-CSCF

comprises providing a SIP NOTIFY message via an IMS Service Control (ISC)

interface.

In the same field of endeavor, Grech discloses an application server (pg. 2,

service platforms and interfaces).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, Wong,

and Bohm with the teachings of Grech in order to host and execute services, and

interface with the S-CSCF using SIP.

However, Campbell, Kalland, Wong, Bohm, and Grech does not clearly

disclose wherein providing a notification message from the AS to the S-CSCF

comprises providing a SIP NOTIFY message via an IMS Service Control (ISC)

interface.

In the same field of endeavor, Tosi discloses wherein providing a notification

message from the AS to the S-CSCF comprises providing a SIP NOTIFY message

via an IMS Service Control (ISC) interface (pg. 3, Present Agent, pg. 6, Presence

Management).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, Wong,

Bohm, and Grech with the teachings of Tosi in order to notify when a user becomes

reachable or not reachable to start the subscribe procedure to the user presence.

50.   With respect to claim 34, Campbell, Kalland, Wong, and Bohm does not

clearly disclose wherein the AS comprises a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) AS,

and wherein: the S-CSCF is configured to subscribe to the event package using a

SIP SUBSCRIBE method; and the SIP AS is configured to issue the notification to

the subscribing S-CSCF using a SIP NOTIFY method.

In the same field of endeavor, Grech discloses wherein the AS comprises a

Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) AS (pg. 2, service platforms and interfaces).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, Wong,

and Bohm with the teachings of Grech in order to host and execute services, and

interface with the S-CSCF using SIP.

However, Campbell, Kalland, Wong, Bohm, and Grech does not clearly

disclose the S-CSCF is configured to subscribe to the event package using a SIP

SUBSCRIBE method; and the SIP AS is configured to issue the notification to the

subscribing S-CSCF using a SIP NOTIFY method.

In the same field of endeavor, Tosi discloses wherein the S-CSCF is configured to subscribe to the event package using a SIP SUBSCRIBE method (pg. 6, Presence Management); and the SIP AS is configured to issue the notification to the subscribing S-CSCF using a SIP NOTIFY method (pg. 3, Present Agent).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Campbell, Kalland, Wong, Bohm, and Grech with the teachings of Tosi in order to notify when a user becomes reachable or not reachable to start the subscribe procedure to the user presence and to retrieve/subscribe/register the user profiles which contain subscription-related information.

Conclusion

51.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HO SHIU whose telephone number is (571)270-3810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (8:30am - 4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

July 7, 2008
HTS

Ho Ting Shiu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2157

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157